

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 1-20 were pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 11, and 16 are independent. In the Final Office Action dated June 24, 2008, Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, Claims 1-2, 5-10, and 16-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) and Claims 3-4 and 11-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Following this response, Claims 1-20 remain in this application. Applicants hereby address the Examiner's rejections in turn.

I. Interview Summary

Applicants thank Examiner Ho for the courtesy of a telephone interview on August 6, 2008, requested by the undersigned to discuss the rejection of the current claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) and § 103(a). During the interview, Applicants asserted that the cited references do not render obvious or anticipate the claims as currently amended. In agreement, the Examiner stated that the claims overcome the cited references, but that an updated search would be necessary. No agreement was reached regarding patentability.

II. Change to Attorney Docket Number

Please note that the Attorney Docket Number for this application is now **60001.0231US11/MS304004.1**.

III. Rejection of Claim 20 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

In the Final Office Action dated June 24, 2008, the Examiner rejected Claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as their invention. Claim 20 has been amended, and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendment overcomes this rejection and adds no new matter.

IV. Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a)

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-2, 5-10, and 16-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by Zdun 2002 Publication ("*Zdun*"). Claims 1 and 16 have been amended and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments overcome this rejection and add no new matter.

Amended Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, "a pointer to an extensible markup language (XML) map, wherein the XML map is utilized, by the web part, to locate, retrieve, format, and display source data, the source data being stored at any location on a distributed computing network." Amended Claim 16 includes a similar recitation. Support for these amendments can be found in the specification at least on page 13, lines 9-17.

In contrast, *Zdun* does not disclose an extensible markup language (XML) map used to locate, retrieve, format, and display source data. For example, *Zdun* merely discloses XML-based page templates used to encode configurable data, page content, and page style information in a generic way. (See section 4, paragraph 1.) *Zdun* discloses that XML files describe configurable web elements in a web

application. (See section 4, paragraph 3.) However, *Zdun* fails to disclose an XML map used to locate, retrieve, format, and display source data for *Zdun*'s configurable web elements. Consequently, *Zdun* remains silent regarding an XML map utilized by a web part. Rather, *Zdun* merely discloses providing generic XML-based page templates.

Zdun does not anticipate the claimed invention because *Zdun* at least does not disclose "a pointer to an extensible markup language (XML) map, wherein the XML map is utilized, by the web part, to locate, retrieve, format, and display source data, the source data being stored at any location on a distributed computing network," as recited by amended Claim 1. Amended Claim 16 includes a similar recitation. Accordingly, independent Claims 1 and 16 each patentably distinguishes the present invention over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claims 1 and 16.

Dependent Claims 2, 5-10, and 17-20 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claims 1 and 16, and by virtue of their respective dependencies upon independent Claims 1 and 16. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 2, 5-10, and 17-20.

V. Rejection of Claims 3-4 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 3-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Zdun* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,757,707 ("*Houghton*"). Applicants respectfully submit that dependent Claims 3-4 are allowable

at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claim 1, and by virtue of their dependency upon independent Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claim 1.

VI. Rejection of Claims 11-15 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 11 and 14-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Zdun* in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,993,569 (“*Rees*”). In addition, Claims 12-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Zdun* in view of *Rees*. Claim 11 has been amended, and Applicants respectfully submit that the amendment overcomes this rejection and adds no new matter.

Amended Claim 11 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, “a pointer to an XML map, wherein the XML map is configured to be utilized, by the web part, to locate, retrieve, format, and display source data, the source data being stored at any location on a distributed computing network.” Support for these amendments can be found in the specification at least on page 13, lines 9-17.

In contrast, and as established above, *Zdun* does not disclose an XML map used to locate, retrieve, format, and display source data. Furthermore, *Rees* does not overcome *Zdun*’s deficiencies. For example, *Rees* merely discloses that a client at a remote location receives a transmitted executable and then later receives generated data. (See Col. 1, lines 61-63.) *Rees*’s client includes a client processor that executes the executable and indicates that a client computer is waiting for the data.

(See Col. 1, lines 63-65.) Accordingly, by receiving and executing the executable before the data is received, *Rees*'s client can inform a user that the client is waiting for the data. (See Col. 1, lines 65-67.) Nowhere in *Rees* does it disclose an XML map used to locate, retrieve, format, and display source data for a web part. Accordingly, like *Zdun*, *Rees* remains silent regarding an XML map utilized by a web part. Rather, *Rees* merely discloses transmitting an executable prior to further transmitting generated data.

Combining *Zdun* with *Rees* would not have led to the claimed invention because *Zdun* and *Rees* either individually or in combination, at least do not disclose "a pointer to an XML map, wherein the XML map is configured to be utilized, by the web part, to locate, retrieve, format, and display source data, the source data being stored at any location on a distributed computing network," as recited by amended Claim 11. Accordingly, independent Claim 11 patentably distinguishes the present invention over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of Claim 11.

Dependent Claims 12-15 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claim 11, and by virtue of their dependency upon independent Claims 11. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 12-15.

VII. Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request that this Amendment After Final be entered by the Examiner, placing the claims in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully submit that the proposed amendments of the claims do not raise new issues or necessitate the undertaking of any additional search of the art by the Examiner, since all of the elements and their relationships claimed were either earlier claimed or inherent in the claims as examined. Therefore, this Amendment should allow for immediate action by the Examiner.

Finally, Applicants respectfully submit that the entry of the Amendment would place the application in better form for appeal, should the Examiner dispute the patentability of the pending claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims, as amended, are patentable over the cited references. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Final Official Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Final Official Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability.

Furthermore, the Final Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Final Office Action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
404.954.5066

/D. Kent Stier/

Date: August 25, 2008

D. Kent Stier
Reg. No. 50,640

DKS:mdc

